UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,364	01/24/2002	Tomoya Yoshida	02036/LH	2010

1933 7590 12/21/2005

FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC
220 Fifth Avenue
16TH Floor
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708

EXAMINER	
JOO, JOSHUA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,364	YOSHIDA, TOMOYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua Joo	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *14-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *14-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment filed 9/28/2005

1. Claims 1-13 are canceled by the Applicant.

2. Claims 14-24 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14-15, 17, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama, US Patent #5,819,110 (Motoyama hereinafter), in view of Konishi, US Publication #2004/0012807 (Konishi hereinafter).

5. As per claim 14, Motoyama teaches substantial features of the claimed invention including an administration system comprising:

an image forming apparatus located in a first local network and connected to the Internet through a first firewall server of the first local network (Fig. 1; Col 3, line 18-25. First network comprising facsimile machine. Col 3, line 65-67. Firewall connected between first network and Internet.); and

a monitoring device located outside the first local network and connected to the Internet (Col 3, line 36-37. Monitoring device communicates through the Internet.);

wherein the image forming apparatus comprises:

a transmitting section which transmits trouble type information to the relaying server (Col; 8, lines 54-56. Notifies of problem. Col 9, line 65-Col 10, line 3. Receives information. Col 11, lines 1-3. Generates an alert or warning.),

an accessing section which accesses the monitoring device to obtain restoration work information based on the trouble type information (Col 10, lines 4-5. Receives commands.), and

a control section which controls the image forming apparatus to conduct an automatic restoration process in accordance with the restoration work information (Col 10, line 5-6. Monitored device changes parameters. Col 10, line 14-16. Process simple or complex instructions.); and

wherein the monitoring device comprises a memory which stores the trouble type information transmitted from the image forming apparatus (Col 9, lines 55-60. Database stores various information regarding the monitored device including service history. Col 10, line 35-41. Database to describe malfunctions or other conditions.).

6. Motoyama teaches substantial features of the claimed invention including communication between an image forming apparatus and a monitoring device across the Internet. However, Motoyama does not teach of a relaying server outside the first network in communication with the image forming apparatus.

7. Konishi teaches of a system comprising a relay server communicating between an image forming apparatus and a host computer (Paragraph 0117).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Motoyama with the teachings of Konishi because both teachings deal with monitoring the status of image forming apparatuses. Furthermore, the teachings of Konishi to implement a relay server to provide communication with the image

forming apparatus would improve the system of Motoyama by providing an apparatus in the network capable of storing and transferring information send by the host computer as taught by Konishi.

9. As per claim 15, Motoyama teaches the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 14, further comprising a database which stores a plurality of items of trouble type information and a plurality of items of restoration work information in correspondence with each other (Col 10, line 14-16; Col 9. lines 56-59. Database describing various information of the monitored device. Col 9, line 66-Col 10, line 3. Compares received information with information in database, and determines changes.).

10. As per claim 17, Motoyama does not teach the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 15, wherein the relaying server provides the corresponding restoration information for retrieval by the image forming apparatus based on the trouble type information received from the image forming apparatus.

11. Konishi teaches the concept of requesting information from a relay server (Paragraph 0119; 121.).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Motoyama with the teachings of Konishi because the teachings of Konishi to implement a relay server that provides information for retrieval would improve the system of Motoyama and Konishi by allowing access of information from an intermediate apparatus without having to directly access the monitoring device, thus reducing traffic on the network and the burden of the monitoring device.

13. As per claim 21, Motoyama does not teach the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 15, wherein the relaying server comprises the database.

14. Konishi teaches of a relay server comprising a database (Paragraph 0017-0119).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Motoyama and Konishi because the teachings of Konishi for a relay server to comprise a database would improve the system of Motoyama by allowing the relay server to store information regarding the image forming apparatus, thereby allowing a host computer to obtain information without accessing the image forming apparatus.

16. As per claim 22, Motoyama teaches the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 15, further comprising:

an administration apparatus located in a second local network and connected to the Internet through a second firewall server of the second local network (Fig. 1; Col 3, lines 35-37. Monitoring device communicate through Internet. Col 4, lines 1-13. Stations in network);

wherein the administration apparatus comprises the database (Col 9, line 56-59; Col 10, line48-51. Database.).

17. As per claim 23, Motoyama teaches the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 14, wherein the image forming apparatus further comprises:

a detecting section which detects when a trouble occurs in the image forming apparatus (Col 8, lines 54-56; Col 11, lines 1-3. Detects trouble.); and

a judging section which determines a kind of the trouble (Col 8, lines 44-51. Determines if event requires communication and the method of communication.); and

wherein the image forming apparatus transmits the trouble type information in accordance with the determined kind of the trouble (Col 8, line 42-54. Transmits determined kind of trouble.).

18. Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama and Konishi, in view of Motoyama, US Patent #5,887,216 (Motoyama '216 hereinafter).

19. As per claim 16, Motoyama teaches the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 15, wherein the stored items of restoration work information correspond to the items of trouble type information as being restorable (Col 10, lines 3-6. Transmits commands to change parameter.). However, Motoyama does not teach explicitly teach of classifying the trouble type information as restorable and non-restorable trouble.

20. Motoyama '216 teaches of receiving problem information and determining if the problem is correctable. If the problem can be corrected, the service center transmits commands to correct the problem (Col 17, lines 41-46).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Motoyama, Konishi, and Motoyama '216 because the teachings of Motoyama '216 to determine if the problem can be correctable would improve the system of Motoyama and Konishi by allowing the monitoring device to attempt corrections over the network if the type of problem is classified as correctable or performing a service call to correct the problem as taught by Motoyama '216.

22. As per claim 18, Motoyama does not teach the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 16, wherein the relaying server judges whether or not the image forming apparatus is able to conduct the automatic restoration process by itself by accessing the database.

23. Motoyama '216 teaches the concept of automatically communicating with a server center (Col 20, lines 15-19), and the service center determining if the apparatus can correct itself by sending a command to change the parameters (Col 17, lines 34-46).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Motoyama, Konishi, and Motoyama '216 because the teachings of Motoyama '216 to determine whether or not the image informing apparatus is able to conduct automatic process would improve the system of Motoyama and Konishi by allowing the image forming apparatus to correct itself if possible, thus avoiding a service call to correct the apparatus.

25. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama and Konishi, in view of Bealkowski et al, US Patent #5,878,256 (Bealkowski hereinafter).

26. As per claim 19, Motoyama teaches of maintaining a complete service history of the printer (Col 10, line 48-50) and of a printer that performs commands (Col 10, lines 4-6; Col 12, lines 38-59). However, Motoyama does not teach the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 14, wherein when the automatic restoration process is carried out, the

transmitting section of the image forming apparatus transmits result information specifying a result of the automatic restoration process to the relaying server.

27. Bealkowski teaches of updating firmware in an apparatus to correct errors where a status message is provided indicating if the update procedure was successful or not successful (Col 14, lines 8, 32-40).

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Motoyama, Konishi, and Bealkowski because since Motoyama teaches of configuring and correcting problems of a printer, it would be desirable feature for the monitoring device to receive information regarding the status of the performed operations. The teachings of Bealkowski to receive the status information of a process would improve the system of Motoyama and Konishi by providing information, which would allow the monitoring device to determine if the problem was corrected, thus performing additional functions to correct problems if necessary.

29. As per claim 20, Motoyama teaches of an administration apparatus system, further comprising: an administration apparatus located in a second local network and connected to the Internet through a second firewall server of the second local network (Col 3, lines 35-37. Monitoring device communicate through Internet. Col 4, lines 1-13. Stations in network.). However, Motoyama does not teach, wherein the administration apparatus accesses the relaying server to obtain the result information.

30. Konishi teaches the concept a host computer may obtain information that is stored on a relay server (Paragraph 0118-0119).

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Motoyama, Bealkowski, and Konishi because the teachings of Konishi to implement a relay server and for a host computer to obtain information stored on the relay server would improve the system of Motoyama, Bealkowski, and Konishi by allowing the host computer to obtain information from an intermediate apparatus without having to access individual image forming apparatuses.

32. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama and Konishi, in view of Wiklof et al, US Patent #6,618,162 (Wiklof hereinafter).

33. As per claim 24, Motoyama does not teach the image forming apparatus administration system of claim 14, wherein the restoration work information is periodically updated.

34. Wiklof teaches the concept of updating restoration work, such as a printer's software (Col 6, lines 25-26), where software may include bug fixes (Col 5, lines 22-25).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Motoyama, Konishi, and Wiklof because the teachings of Wiklof to provide a printer's software as the restoration work and update the software would enhance the system of Motoyama and Konishi by allowing the monitoring device to correct software problems in the printer and ensuring that image forming apparatus operates with an update software for optimum performance.

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

37. Applicant argued that (1) Motoyama discloses that communication relating to matters such as repairs which require attention should not be handled via the Internet.

Examiner traverse the argument:

38. As to point (1), even though claim 14 states that the image forming apparatus and the relaying server are connected to the Internet, it is respectfully noted that the claim does not explicitly define that the trouble type information is transmitted over an Internet. The claim states, "wherein the image forming apparatus comprises: a transmitting section which transmits trouble type information to the relaying server,". The image forming apparatus and the relaying server may be connected by Internet, but the claim does not provide the limitation that the communication is by the Internet. Therefore, the communication may be by other means.

In addition, in column 12, lines 59-62, Motoyama teaches that Internet access is also possible through a telephone line or ISDN.

Conclusion

39. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

40. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7 to 4.

42. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

43. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 15, 2005
JJ

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100